



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

not identical; but it must be set over against the thesis of idea, sound or gesture, as "answer" stands over against question in speech, or theme in music, or first swing of body or fling of leg in the dance. At all events, until repetition began, poetry had not begun. There might be frantic gesture or pompous song; but the language was prose, no matter how eloquent, so long as repetition, incessant and according to some law, did not set off what was said as different in form from common speech.

I have not based anything on the more or less successful attempts to find a rhythm in the Hebrew poetry. If it is there, then the poetic form is somewhat further developed than appears to the average reader of the Hebrew Bible; but repetition would still mark the kinship of that ancient poetry to those compositions which we dignify by that name, and repetition made the Hebrew parallels poetic even in the absence of rhythm.

I have argued myself into believing that I was right, after all, in those old student days; but this will make my present intrusion into an alien domain of learning all the more presumptuous, and the more sure of its grievous but fit punishment.

---

## HOW FAR DOES THE CLAIM OF A DIVINE ORIGIN FOR THE BIBLE DEPEND UPON THE GENUINENESS OF ITS SEPARATE BOOKS?

BY REV. GEO. W. KING,

Providence, R. I.

---

There is so much confusion in the minds of some as to this question, that a few facts need to be deduced and emphasized. In the work of Conybeare and Howson, on the "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," in the chapter on the Epistle to the Hebrews, is the following: "There is no portion of the New Testament whose authorship is so much disputed; nor any of which the inspiration is more indisputable." This statement concerns a single book, and has the following qualifications: (1) It was written in apostolic times, and under apostolic sanction. As proof of this are the facts that it was certainly written before the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70) as evidenced by the many allusions to the temple and temple-services as still existing (e. g. ch. 13:11-13); that the author was acquainted with Timothy (13:23), and was over an apostolic church (13:19); and that it was accepted from the earliest times by the church as apostolic (see Conybeare and Howson, *ibid.*). (2) It is in harmony, in its teaching, with other books whose genuineness is undoubted, i. e. it is in harmony with the analogy of faith. (This pertains to it as didactic and not historic.) (3) It does not claim to have been written by any known author, i. e. its author is not given in its contents. With these qualifications the genuineness of the book does not affect its inspiration. If there are other books with these qualifications, or similar ones, they stand upon the same basis. Thus, in this category are to be placed, for example, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings and some of the Psalms. That is, the genuineness of these books does not affect the question of their inspiration because of

certain qualifications which make this appear. Among other things, (1) it is evident, in the case of the historic books, that they were written by authors who had sufficient sources of material for truthful history. Besides, there is no just reason to suspect their trustworthiness. (2) In the case of the Psalms referred to and also the historical books, no claim is made for any particular author.

But, from these and similar special cases, the broad generalization is frequently and loosely made, that the Bible, as a whole, is not affected, in its inspiration, by the question of genuineness. Thus, in a recent book by a popular writer ("In Aid of Faith," by Lyman Abbott, D. D.,—a book, by the way, which is qualified more to unsettle than aid faith) we find the following: "Questions of authorship are literary questions, not religious questions; and the value of the Bible as a literature which embodies the promise of God does not in the least depend upon them" (p. 135). Over against this loose talk I place a statement of an eminent biblical scholar as to Ecclesiastes: "If this book was not written by Solomon, it is a base forgery" (Dr. James Strong, of Drew Theol. Seminary. From memory in class-room). The reason for this assertion is the assumption that the book claims to have been written by Solomon (ch. 1:1). I know that other scholars decide that the book does not make this claim, i. e. they explain away the apparent claim, and this is a matter of criticism and beyond my aim in this article to determine; but if the book really claims to have been written by Solomon, then the conclusion of Dr. Strong is inevitable, of course.

So far, then, in this case, is the question of genuineness intimately connected with that of authenticity and inspiration.

The same is true of other books, as, for instance, the Pentateuch. There seems to be clear internal evidence, in these books, that they claim to have been written by Moses. If this claim is made, then, clearly, the Mosaic authorship is bound up with the question of their inspiration as this is bound up with that of its authenticity. Furthermore, if they were not written by Moses, but at some later date, as, for instance, in the time of the claim of some critics—in the time of David, Josiah, or Jeremiah, for example—then there is no sufficient historic basis for the miracles recorded in them, and the conclusions of such critics are the more probable; indeed, the only sound ones.

To state the matter in another form, to prove that the genuineness of the Pentateuch does not affect its authenticity, it must be shown (1) that it makes no claim to have been written by Moses; (2) that, not making this claim, it was certainly written at, or soon after, the time in which the events and miracles are said to have occurred, and by some trustworthy authority; at least, these things must not be disproved. In any case the question of authorship is closely connected with that of authenticity. It is needless to multiply illustrations. The following may be regarded as some, at least, of the rules by which these questions are to be governed: (1) The genuineness of a book must not be claimed unless admitted. Otherwise (provided the claim cannot be shown to be an interpolation of later date) the book is a forgery, and this is not compatible with the idea of its inspiration. (2) In any case, it must be shown to have been written by a competent and trustworthy authority. (3) If didactic it must be in harmony with the other Scriptures.

To state the conclusion in a single sentence, The question of inspiration is concerned with the question of genuineness in proportion as the question of

authenticity is concerned with it. The whole work of the higher criticism—a work conducted by many of the ablest and most scholarly men we have—bears lasting witness to the importance of the question. Besides, so important is it, that many critics, starting with the assumption that miracles and all supernatural religion are unreasonable, seek to prove that the books of the Bible are not authentic by endeavoring to prove that they are not genuine.

So far, then, is the statement of Dr. Abbott from being true, unless it be assumed that the promise of God can be found in the midst of books written by impostors, or in the midst of fables and myths. Perhaps the author would not object to this conclusion; but to most men it would invalidate any claim of any revelation other than that of deists. The question is more than literary; it is religious, as the claim of a divine revelation is at the foundation of all true religion.

---

## THE FIGURATIVE ELEMENT IN JOB. II.

BY MR. JOHN S. ZELIE,

Yale Divinity School, New Haven.

---

It is almost impossible to make any exact classification of Job's figures; but there are certainly lines of thought and usage along which the figurative element is specially distinct. The first conspicuous characteristic is that, while Job uses *not fewer* figures, he uses them *less consciously*. To this conflict of ideas the friends brought nothing new, and so it became their object to state their ideas in the best possible form. They would not admit the possibility of any addition to their knowledge, and so the addition must be to their rhetoric. They are conscious of their style and we occasionally find them looking back, as it were, over a fine piece of eloquence and calling attention either to its truth or beauty. But in Job we come into contact with a human life and not a creed, and the figures change, as we might expect, becoming less stilted and more natural. His figures are always subservient to his thought. Job's thought carries us along with it, and we forget his rhetoric in thinking of him. No doubt in this very fact we find a design of the author, who reveals his highest art in concealing it. Thought and figure are woven together and we do not separate.

We cannot name the source of Job's figures. From every department of life and knowledge the figures come trooping up into his mind. We may say of his figures what Davidson says of his thought: "There is much humanity in Job and his mind moves by preference in the region of human feelings, rights of the wretched, claims of sentient life, mysteries and riddles." From the human body, the heavens, business, warfare, common vegetation and more largely from the phenomena of nature he draws his illustrations, but his view of nature yields him no high idea of law, but only mere will. Courts of justice and their manners furnish him a constant source of figure; the friends take up the same line to show the absurdity of his asking for such justice as courts give; we find it in Elihu's pretentious offer of his services as daysman, in Jehovah's final answer from the storm, and the last figure of the book from Job's own lips is drawn from this line of life.